



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/259,427 02/26/99 SLOO

M 27080

TM02/0925

THOMAS B LUEBBERING
HOVEY WILLIAMS TIMMONS & COLLINS
2405 GRAND BOULEVARD
SUITE 400
KANSAS CITY MO 64108

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

DATE MAILED:

09/25/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/259,427

Applicant(s)
Sloo

Examiner
Nguyen Nga B

Art Unit
2164



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 26, 1999

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 4

20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2164

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the communication filed on February 26, 1999 , which paper has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claim 1-16 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stickney, U.S. Patent No. 6,043,813.

Regarding to claim 1, Stickney discloses a computer-based method of collecting and processing incidents observed by witnesses comprising the steps of:

receiving into a computer system an incident report from a witness who observed an incident committed by an offender (column 3, lines 55-67);

prompting the witness to provide certain types of information about the incident (column 4, lines 1-15).

Art Unit: 2164

Stickney does not disclose selecting an authority to whom the incident report should be sent and sending the incident report to the selected authority so that the authority can respond to the incident report. Official notice is taken that sending the information to the selected persons via such as electronic mail are well known in the art . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the features above with Stickney's for the purpose of sending the information to the selected persons.

Regarding to claim 2, Stickney further discloses the incident being selected from the group consisting of a criminal act, a legal violation, a sale of a defective product, and a rendering of an unsatisfactory service (column 1, lines 14-20).

Regarding to claim 3, Stickney further discloses prompting the witness to enter into the incident report identification information identifying the offender (column 3, lines 55-67).

Regarding to claims 4-5, Stickney further discloses receiving additional identification information identifying the offender and adding the additional identification information to the incident report; the additional information being obtained by searching files accessible by the computer system based on the identification information entered by the witness (columns 6-8).

Regarding to claim 6, Stickney does not discloses the additional identification information being obtained by receiving the additional identification information from the authority based on the identification information entered by the witness. Official notice is taken that obtaining the additional information from another person is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 2164

made to include the feature above with Stickney's for the purpose of receiving the additional information from another person.

Regarding to claims 7-8, Stickney does not disclose the authority is automatically selected by the computer system based on information entered into the incident report by the witness or the authority is selected by the witness. Official notice is taken that selecting the authority to send out the information by the computer system or by the person is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature above with Stickney's for the purpose of sending the information to the selected authority.

Regarding to claims 9-10, Stickney does not disclose receiving into the computer system an action report from the authority explaining the action the authority took in response to the incident report and storing the action report along with the incident report in a file accessible by the computer system. Official notice is taken that receiving into the computer system the information from the person and storing the information in a file accessible by the computer system are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the features above with Stickney's for the purpose of storing the information received from the person in a file accessible by the computer system

Regarding to claim 11, Stickney incident reports from a plurality of different witnesses are received in the computer system (figure 1).

Art Unit: 2164

Regarding to claims 12-14, Stickney does not disclose storing the incident reports in a searchable database, permitting persons to access the searchable database to view the incident reports, and receiving additional incident information from the persons that access the searchable database and adding the additional incident information to the incident reports to assist the authorities. Official notice is taken that storing the reports in a searchable database and permitting persons to access the searchable database to add the additional information to the reports are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the features above with Stickney's for the purpose of updating the information stored in the searchable database.

Regarding to claims 15-16, Stickney does not disclose sending the additional identification information to the witness and prompting the witness to update the incident report based on the additional identification information. Official notice is taken that sending information to the persons and prompting the persons to update the information are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the features above with Stickney's for the purpose of updating the information stored in the database.

Conclusion

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected.

Art Unit: 2164

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703)306-2901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent A. Millin, can be reached on (703)308-1065.

7. **Any response to this action should be mail to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

c/o Technology Center 2700

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 308-5397 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II,

2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington.

VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/259,427

Page 7

Art Unit: 2164

Nga B. Nguyen
September 18, 2001

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'V. Millin', written in a cursive style.

VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100